arXiv:1411.4279v1 [hep-ph] 16 Nov 2014

The $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ total cross section in NLA BFKL

Dmitry Yu. Ivanov*, Beatrice Murdaca† and Alessandro Papa†

*Sobolev Institute of Mathematics and Novosibirsk State University, 630090 Novosibirsk
†Dipartimento di Fisica, Università della Calabria, and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Gruppo collegato di Cosenza, Arcavacata di Rende, I-87036 Cosenza, Italy

Abstract. We study the $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ total cross section in the NLA BFKL approach. We have extracted the NLO corrections to the photon impact factor from two recent papers of Balitsky and Chirilli and Chirilli and Kovchegov and used them to build several representations of the total cross section, equivalent within the NLA. We have combined these different representations with two among the most common methods for the optimization of a perturbative series, namely PMS and BLM, and compared their behavior with the energy with the only available experimental data, those from the LEP2 collider.

Keywords: Photon-photon total cross section, BFKL resummation
PACS: 12.38.Bx,12.38.Cy,13.85.Lg

INTRODUCTION

The total cross section for the collision of two off-shell photons with large virtualities is an important test ground for perturbative QCD. At a fixed order of α_s and at low energies, the dominant contribution comes from the quark box, calculated at the leading-order (LO) in Refs. [1] (see Fig. 1 (left)) and at the next-to-LO (NLO) in Ref. [2]. In Ref. [3] the resummation of double logs appearing in the NLO corrections to the quark box was also studied. At higher energies, the gluon exchange in the t-channel becomes dominant and gives terms with powers of energy logs which must be resummed to all orders.

The procedure for this resummation in the leading logarithmic approximation (LLA) (terms $(\alpha_s \ln(s))^n$) and in the next-to-leading logarithmic approximation (NLA) (terms $\alpha_s(\alpha_s \ln(s))^n$) has been established within the BFKL approach [4]: the imaginary part of an amplitude (and, hence, a total cross section) for a large-s hard collision process reads as the convolution of the Green's function of two interacting Reggeized gluons with the impact factors (IFs) of the colliding particles (see Fig. 1 (right)).

The Green's function is universal and is known in the NLA for singlet color representation in the t-channel and forward scattering [5]. The leading order (LO) photon IF is known since long, but it took years to calculate the next-to-LO (NLO) one [6]. Its lengthy expression, in the momentum representation, was published over a few years in pieces, some of them available only in the form of a numerical code, thus making it of limited practical use. Indeed, so far, the inclusion of BFKL resummation effects in the NLA calculation of the $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ total cross section was carried out approximately, taking NLA Green's function and LO IFs [7, 8, 9]. A few months ago, the NLO photon IF was calculated in the coordinate space and then transformed to the momentum representation and to the Mellin (or γ-representation) [10] (see also [11]). It turns out that its expression is very simple in all representations, thus confirming (see, for instance, [12]) that the use of the coordinate representation leads to simple expressions, which, in the momentum representation, would result after not so obvious cancellations.

Now all ingredients are available to build the $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ total cross in NLA BFKL. Previous studies based on the NLA BFKL approach, such as the photoproduction of two light vector mesons [13, 14, 15] and the production of Mueller-Navelet jets [16, 17], have clearly shown that NLA expressions for an observable (such as a cross-section or an azimuthal correlation), though being formally equivalent up to subleading terms, may lead to somewhat different numerical estimates. This derives from the fact that NLO BFKL corrections are typically of opposite sign with respect to the LO and large in absolute value and calls for (i) an optimization procedure for the perturbative series and (ii) a check of the stability of the numerical result under change of the representation, within a large enough class of NLA-equivalent expressions.

In this paper we compare several NLA-equivalent representations of the $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ total cross section, using two methods of optimization of the perturbative series, the principle of minimal sensitivity (PMS) [18] and the Brodsky-Lepage-Mackenzie (BLM) method [19]. Results will be contrasted with the experimental data obtained at LEP2 [20, 21].



FIGURE 1. (Left) Quark box LO diagrams. (Right) Schematic representation of the $\gamma^*(p_1)\gamma^*(p_2)$ forward scattering.

BFKL CONTRIBUTION TO THE $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ TOTAL CROSS SECTION

The total cross section of two unpolarized photons with virtualities Q_1 and Q_2 in LLA BFKL and in the Mellin-representation (also said γ- or ν-representation), it is given by (see, for instance, Ref. [7]):

$$\sigma_{\rm tot}^{\gamma^*\gamma^*}(s,Q_1,Q_2) = \sum_{i,k=T,L} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 Q_1 Q_2} \int\limits_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \left(\frac{Q_1^2}{Q_2^2}\right)^{i\nu} F_i(\nu) F_k(-\nu) \left(\frac{s}{s_0}\right)^{\bar{\alpha}_s \chi(\nu)} , \tag{1}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_s \equiv \alpha_s(\mu_R) N_c/\pi$, with N_c the number of colors, $\chi(\nu) = 2\psi(1) - \psi(1/2+i\nu) - \psi(1/2-i\nu)$ and

$$F_T(\nu) = F_T(-\nu) = \alpha\alpha_s \left(\sum_q e_q^2\right) \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{(\frac{3}{2}-i\nu)(\frac{3}{2}+i\nu)\Gamma^2(\frac{1}{2}-i\nu)\Gamma^2(\frac{1}{2}+i\nu)}{\Gamma(2-i\nu)\Gamma(2+i\nu)} = \alpha\alpha_s \left(\sum_q e_q^2\right) \frac{\pi^2}{8} \frac{9+4\nu^2}{\nu(1+\nu^2)} \frac{\sinh(\pi\nu)}{\cosh^2(\pi\nu)},$$

$$F_L(\nu) = F_L(-\nu) = \alpha\alpha_s \left(\sum_q e_q^2\right) \pi \frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{2}-i\nu)\Gamma(\frac{3}{2}+i\nu)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}-i\nu)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}+i\nu)}{\Gamma(2-i\nu)\Gamma(2+i\nu)} = \alpha\alpha_s \left(\sum_q e_q^2\right) \frac{\pi^2}{4} \frac{1+4\nu^2}{\nu(1+\nu^2)} \frac{\sinh(\pi\nu)}{\cosh^2(\pi\nu)}$$

are the LO IFs for transverse and longitudinal polarizations, respectively. Here, α is the electromagnetic coupling constant, the summation extends over all active quarks (taken massless) and e_q is the quark electric charge in units of the electron charge. In the LLA BFKL cross section (1) the scales μ_R and s_0 are not fixed.

Following Refs. [14], it is possible to write down the NLA BFKL cross section as follows:

$$\sigma_{\rm tot}^{\gamma^*\gamma^*}(s,Q_1,Q_2,s_0,\mu_R) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 Q_1 Q_2} \int\limits_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \left(\frac{Q_1^2}{Q_2^2}\right)^{i\nu} \left(\frac{s}{s_0}\right)^{\bar{\alpha}_s(\mu_R)\chi(\nu)} \sum_{i,k=T,L} F_i(\nu) F_k(-\nu) \left\{1 + \bar{\alpha}_s(\mu_R) \left(\frac{F_i^{(1)}(\nu,s_0,\mu_R)}{F_i(\nu)}\right.\right.$$

$$\left.\left. + \frac{F_k^{(1)}(-\nu,s_0,\mu_R)}{F_k(-\nu)}\right) + \bar{\alpha}_s^2(\mu_R) \ln\left(\frac{s}{s_0}\right) \left[\bar{\chi}(\nu) + \frac{\beta_0}{8N_c}\chi(\nu)\left(-\chi(\nu) + \frac{10}{3} + 2\ln\frac{\mu_R^2}{Q_1 Q_2}\right)\right]\right\} , \tag{2}$$

where

$$\bar{\chi}(\nu) = -\frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{\pi^2-4}{3}\chi(\nu) - 6\zeta(3) - \chi''(\nu) - \frac{\pi^3}{\cosh(\pi\nu)} + \frac{\pi^2\sinh(\pi\nu)}{2\,\nu\cosh^2(\pi\nu)}\left(3 + \left(1+\frac{n_f}{N_c^3}\right)\frac{11+12\nu^2}{16(1+\nu^2)}\right) + 4\phi(\nu)\right] ,$$

$$\phi(\nu) = 2\int\limits_0^1 dx \frac{\cos(\nu\ln(x))}{(1+x)\sqrt{x}}\left[\frac{\pi^2}{6} - {\rm Li}_2(x)\right] , \quad {\rm Li}_2(x) = -\int\limits_0^x dt \frac{\ln(1-t)}{t} ,$$

n_f is the number of active quarks, $F_{L,T}^{(1)}(\nu,s_0,\mu_R)$ are the NLO corrections to the longitudinal/transverse photon IF in the ν-representation and $\beta_0 = 11N_c/3 - 2n_f/3$.



FIGURE 2. $\sigma_{\rm tot}^{(\rm series)}$ *versus* Y at $Q^2 = 17$ GeV^2 ($n_f = 4$) (magenta line), together with the experimental data from OPAL (blue points, $Q^2 = 18$ GeV^2) and L3 (green points, $Q^2 = 16$ GeV^2); the cyan line represents the result of Ref. [8] (see Fig. 3 there).

By comparing Eq. (2) with the $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ cross section obtained in the Wilson-line operator expansion scheme by Chirilli and Kovchegov [11], we can extract the NLO parts of the photon IFs (for details, see [22]),

$$\frac{F_T^{(1)}(\nu,s_0,\mu_R)}{F_T(\nu)} = \frac{\chi(\nu)}{2}\ln\frac{s_0}{Q^2} + \frac{\beta_0}{4N_c}\ln\frac{\mu_R^2}{Q^2} + \frac{3C_F}{4N_c} - \frac{5}{18}\frac{n_f}{N_c} + \frac{\pi^2}{4} + \frac{85}{36} - \frac{\pi^2}{\cosh^2(\pi\nu)} - \frac{4}{1+4\nu^2} + \frac{6\chi(\nu)}{9+4\nu^2}$$
$$+\frac{1}{2(1-2i\nu)} - \frac{1}{2(1+2i\nu)} - \frac{7}{18(3+2i\nu)} + \frac{20}{3(3+2i\nu)^2} - \frac{25}{18(3-2i\nu)} \qquad (3)$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\chi(\nu)\left[\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}-i\nu\right) + 2\psi\left(\frac{3}{2}-i\nu\right) - 2\psi(3-2i\nu) - \psi\left(\frac{5}{2}+i\nu\right)\right]$$

and

$$\frac{F_L^{(1)}(\nu,s_0,\mu_R)}{F_L(\nu)} = \frac{\chi(\nu)}{2}\ln\frac{s_0}{Q^2} + \frac{\beta_0}{4N_c}\ln\frac{\mu_R^2}{Q^2} + \frac{3C_F}{4N_c} - \frac{5}{18}\frac{n_f}{N_c} + \frac{\pi^2}{4} + \frac{85}{36} - \frac{\pi^2}{\cosh^2(\pi\nu)}$$
$$-\frac{8(1+4i\nu)}{(1+2i\nu)^2(1-2i\nu)(3+2i\nu)} + \frac{4}{3-4i\nu+4\nu^2}\chi(\nu) \qquad (4)$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\chi(\nu)\left[\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}-i\nu\right) + 2\psi\left(\frac{3}{2}-i\nu\right) - 2\psi(3-2i\nu) - \psi\left(\frac{5}{2}+i\nu\right)\right] .$$

NUMERICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

We compared several different representations of the NLA $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ total cross section, differing one from the other by terms beyond the NLA, and confront them with the experimental data from the OPAL and L3 experiments at LEP2, taking equal photon virtualities, $Q_1 = Q_2 \equiv Q$, with Q^2=17 GeV^2, and energy range $Y = 2 \div 6$, where $Y \equiv \ln(s/Q^2)$. We considered the following representations: (i) Chirilli-Kovchegov representation, based on the expression for the cross section as given in Ref. [11], calculated at the "natural" scales $s_0 = \mu_R^2 = Q^2$; (ii) series representation with PMS optimization; (iii) exponential representation with PMS optimization; (iv) exponential representation with BLM optimization, in the two variants (a) and (b) discussed in Ref. [23].

In all cases, the quark box contribution was included. For the relevant formulas, tables, plots and other details, we refer to [22]. We show in Fig. 2 the case of the series representation with PMS optimization, which is representative of all other cases: the effect of the BFKL resummation is small and changes only by little the determination coming from the LO quark box diagrams. This means that, in the considered range of energies, the NLO corrections to the photon IF compensate almost exactly the LO ones. Indeed, previous estimates of the cross section [7, 8, 9] using LO IFs together with the NLA BFKL Green's function showed a better agreement with LEP2 data.

Reasons for the disagreement in the range $Y = 3.5 \div 6$ could be: (i) the BFKL contribution still does not dominate over terms which are suppressed by powers of the energy $\sim 1/s$, not included in the present consideration; (ii) the presumably large effects in the next-to-NLA are not under satisfactory control by the representations of the cross section and by the optimization methods we considered. In both cases, the source of the problems is in the large negative value of NLO contributions to the photon IF. Indeed, in the region of $\nu \simeq 0$, which dominates the ν-integral in the cross section, the ratio NLO/LO for the photon IF is more negative than for the photon-to-meson IF (see Ref. [22]).

Another issue is the following: the NLO photon IFs as extracted from [11] have very simple subleading $\sim 1/N_c^2$ contributions, in sharp contrast with the cases of NLO photon-to-meson IF [13] and NLO forward jet IF [16]. It would be interesting to understand the reason for this practically complete cancellation of the subleading $1/N_c^2$ terms. Finally, the photon IF used in this paper (derived from the results in [10, 11]) and the one obtained in the conventional BFKL approach by Bartels and collaborators [6], presented in [24] for the case of transverse polarization, have a very different behavior in the variable x (the dimensionless ratio of the Reggeon transverse momentum and the photon virtuality squared); a qualitative agreement could be obtained reducing the NLO result given in Eq. (3) by the factor ~ 1.87. It is important and urgent that the authors of [24] finally publish their results for the photon IF, since it would be an independent test of the results obtained by Balitsky and Chirilli in a completely different approach.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of D.I. was supported in part by the grant RFBR-13-02-00695-a. The work of B.M. was supported by the European Commission, European Social Fund and Calabria Region, that disclaim any liability for the use that can be done of the information provided in this paper.

REFERENCES

1. V.M. Budnev, I.F. Ginzburg, G.V. Meledin, V.G. Serbo, Phys. Rept. 15 (1975) 181; I. Schienbein, Annals Phys. 301 (2002) 128.
2. M. Cacciari, V. Del Duca, S. Frixione, Z. Trocsanyi, JHEP 0102 (2001) 029.
3. J. Bartels, M. Lublinsky, JHEP 0309 (2003) 076; Mod. Phys. Lett. A 19 (2004) 19691982.
4. V.S. Fadin, E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B 60 (1975) 50; E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov, V.S. Fadin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 71 (1976) 840; 72 (1977) 377; Ya.Ya. Balitskii, L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 28 (1978) 822.
5. V.S. Fadin, L.N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B 429 (1998) 127; M. Ciafaloni, G. Camici, Phys. Lett. B 430 (1998) 349.
6. J. Bartels, S. Gieseke, C.F. Qiao, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2001) 056014 [*Erratum-ibid.* D 65 (2002) 079902]; J. Bartels, S. Gieseke, A. Kyrieleis, Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 014006; J. Bartels, D. Colferai, S. Gieseke, A. Kyrieleis, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 094017; J. Bartels, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) (2003) 116; J. Bartels, A. Kyrieleis, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 114003; V.S. Fadin, D.Yu. Ivanov, M.I. Kotsky, Phys. Atom. Nucl. 65 (2002) 1513; Nucl. Phys. B 658 (2003) 156.
7. S.J. Brodsky, V.S. Fadin, V.T. Kim, L.N. Lipatov, G.B. Pivovarov, JETP Lett. 76 (2002) 249; JETP Lett. 70 (1999) 155.
8. F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C 58 (2008) 1-7.
9. X.-C. Zheng, X.-G. Wu, S.-Q. Wang, J.-M. Shen, Q.-L. Zhang, JHEP 1310 (2013) 117.
10. I. Balitsky, G.A. Chirilli, Phys. Rev. D 87 (2013) 014013.
11. G.A. Chirilli, Yu.V. Kovchegov, JHEP 1405 (2014) 099.
12. V.S. Fadin, R. Fiore, A. Papa, Phys. Lett. B 647 (2007) 179; Nucl. Phys. B 769 (2007) 108; V.S. Fadin, R. Fiore, A.V. Grabovsky, A. Papa, Nucl. Phys. B 784 (2007) 49.
13. D.Yu. Ivanov, M.I. Kotsky, A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C 38 (2004) 195-213.
14. D.Yu. Ivanov, A. Papa, Nucl. Phys. B 732 (2006) 183-199; Eur. Phys. J. C 49 (2007) 947-955.
15. F. Caporale, A. Sabio Vera, A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C 53 (2008) 525-532.
16. J. Bartels, D. Colferai, G.P. Vacca, Eur. Phys. J. C 24 (2002) 83; Eur. Phys. J. C 29 (2003) 235; F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, A. Perri, JHEP 02 (2012) 101; D.Yu. Ivanov, A. Papa, JHEP 05 (2012) 086.
17. D. Colferai, F. Schwennsen, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, JHEP 1012 (2010) 026; B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, JHEP 1305 (2013) 096; F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, Nucl. Phys. B 877 (2013) 73; B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112 (2014) 082003.
18. P.M. Stevenson, Phys. Lett. B 100 (1981) 61; Phys. Rev. D 23 (1981) 2916.
19. S.J. Brodsky, G.P. Lepage, P.B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D 28 (1983) 228.
20. P. Achard *et al.* [L3 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 531 (2002) 39.
21. G. Abbiendi *et al.* [OPAL Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C 24 (2002) 17.
22. D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, JHEP 1410 (2014) 58.
23. F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, *On the BLM optimal renormalization scale setting for semihard processes*, in preparation.
24. G. Chachamis, J. Bartels, PoS DIFF 2006 (2006) 026.